



## INSTRUCTIONS

Instructions for items other than those that are self-explanatory, are as follows:

(a) Item 1 (Contract ID Code). Insert the contract type identification code that appears in the title block of the contract being modified.

(b) Item 3 (Effective date).

- (1) For a solicitation amendment, change order, or administrative change, the effective date shall be the issue date of the amendment, change order, or administrative change.
- (2) For a supplemental agreement, the effective date shall be the date agreed to by the contracting parties.
- (3) For a modification issued as an initial or confirming notice of termination for the convenience of the Government, the effective date and the modification number of the confirming notice shall be the same as the effective date and modification number of the initial notice.
- (4) For a modification converting a termination for default to a termination for the convenience of the Government, the effective date shall be the same as the effective date of the termination for default.
- (5) For a modification confirming the contracting officer's determination of the amount due in settlement of a contract termination, the effective date shall be the same as the effective date of the initial decision.

(c) Item 6 (Issued By). Insert the name and address of the issuing office. If applicable, insert the appropriate issuing office code in the code block.

(d) Item 8 (Name and Address of Contractor). For modifications to a contract or order, enter the contractor's name, address, and code as shown in the original contract or order, unless changed by this or a previous modification.

(e) Items 9, (Amendment of Solicitation No.-Dated), and 10, (Modification of Contract/Order No.-Dated). Check the appropriate box and in the corresponding blanks insert the number and date of the original solicitation, contract, or order.

(f) Item 12 (Accounting and Appropriation Data). When appropriate, indicate the impact of the modification on each affected accounting classification by inserting one of the following entries:

- (1) Accounting classification .....  
Net increase \$.....

(2) Accounting classification .....  
Net decrease \$.....

NOTE: If there are changes to multiple accounting classifications that cannot be placed in block 12, insert an asterisk and the words "See continuation sheet".

(g) Item 13. Check the appropriate box to indicate the type of modification. Insert in the corresponding blank the authority under which the modification is issued. Check whether or not contractor must sign this document. (See FAR 43.103.)

(h) Item 14 (Description of Amendment/Modification).

(1) Organize amendments or modifications under the appropriate Uniform Contract Format (UCF) section headings from the applicable solicitation or contract. The UCF table of contents, however, shall not be set forth in this document.

(2) Indicate the impact of the modification on the overall total contract price by inserting one of the following entries:

- (i) Total contract price increased by \$.....
- (ii) Total contract price decreased by \$.....
- (iii) Total contract price unchanged.

(3) State reason for modification.

(4) When removing, reinstating, or adding funds, identify the contract items and accounting classifications.

(5) When the SF 30 is used to reflect a determination by the contracting officer of the amount due in settlement of a contract terminated for the convenience of the Government, the entry in Item 14 of the modification may be limited to -

- (i) A reference to the letter determination; and
- (ii) A statement of the net amount determined to be due in settlement of the contract.

(6) Include subject matter or short title of solicitation/contract where feasible.

(i) Item 16B. The contracting officer's signature is not required on solicitation amendments. The contracting officer's signature is normally affixed last on supplemental agreements.

**SECTION 00110 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS, INSTRUCTIONS, EVALUATION AND  
SELECTION**

- 1.0 GENERAL
- 2.0 PHASE I EVALUATION PROCESS
- 3.0 PHASE I EVALUATION FACTORS
- 4.0 PHASE I DETAILED EVALUATION CRITERIA
- 5.0 PHASE II EVALUATION PROCESS
- 6.0 PHASE II DETAILED EVALUATION CRITERIA
- 7.0 PRICE PROPOSAL
- 8.0 METHOD OF PROPOSAL EVALUATION (PHASE I AND PHASE II)
- 9.0 SELECTION AND AWARD, PHASE II

## SECTION 00110 PROPOSAL EVALUATION AND SELECTION OF OFFERORS

### 1.0 GENERAL

1.1 Section 00100, *in conjunction with this Section*, describes the proposal submission requirements and instructions. A Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB), composed of representatives of the Corps of Engineers and Air Force personnel, will evaluate the proposals. The number and identities of Offerors are not revealed to anyone not involved in the evaluation and award process or to other offerors. The SSEB will evaluate proposals, using the significant factors described in this part.

1.2. This is a “Two Phase Design Build Acquisition” in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation subpart 36.3. One solicitation covers both phases. The Government will evaluate Performance Capability proposals in Phase I to “Shortlist” no more than a minimum of three and a maximum of five of the most highly qualified offerors to participate in Phase II. Detailed project design criteria will then be added by amendment to the solicitation at the start of the Phase II stage of the Request for Proposals. Each firm selected for participation in Phase II will then submit a design-technical proposal, the remainder of the Performance Capability proposal and a Pro Forma package containing the necessary bid bond, price proposal, Subcontracting Plan, if applicable, and other required information, as described in Section 00100 “Proposal Submission Requirements.”

**1.3. The results of the Phase I evaluation will not be considered in arriving at the final overall proposal evaluation. Phase I results will be used to determine which contractors (maximum of five) will move forward to Phase II. Phase I proposals will be considered as part of the offerors overall proposal. Any changes in personnel or subcontractors are subject to approval by the Government. Phase II proposal ratings will be used to determine the most advantageous proposal to the Government. Award of the Design-Build contract will be made to one of the five firms that, in the judgment of the Contracting Officer, provides the best combination of design features and cost/price reasonableness. The Government reserves the right to make award to other than the lowest price offeror, price and other factors considered.**

### 2.0 PHASE I EVALUATION PROCESS

2.1 The evaluation process for Phase I consists essentially of three steps: proposal compliance review; quality evaluation rating and “Short listing”. At the conclusion of the Phase I evaluation process, the SSEB will present its findings to the Source Selection Authority.

2.1.1 **Proposal Compliance Review:** This is an initial check by Contracting Division on the basis of solicitation requirements. This review may eliminate those proposals that fail to provide all required information and documents in the format and detail specified. This review is to ensure that all required information is complete.

2.1.2 **Technical/Quality Evaluation/Rating and Short Listing:** The SSEB will evaluate only those proposals passing the first review, above. Technical/quality evaluation consists of an evaluation and assigning a quality/risk rating to the Phase I factors and sub factors. After the quality evaluations are complete, the Government will then select no more than five most highly qualified offerors and request them to submit Phase II proposals. At this time, the Government will notify all Phase I offerors of their status and issue an amendment calling for Phase II proposals. The Government may amend the technical solicitation requirements at that time, if necessary to clarify or revise the Phase II design criteria.

2.1.2.1 Potential offerors should note that the Government does not intend to conduct discussions during Phase I, nor request revised Phase I proposals. Therefore, Phase I offerors should carefully review the Phase I proposal submission requirements in Section 00100 and submit the requested information in the required format.

2.1.2.2 The Government reserves the right to conduct Phase I discussions, if it deems such to be in

its best interests. The Government may communicate with Phase I offerors for minor clarifications to their proposal. The Government may also communicate with an offeror to afford it the opportunity to respond to adverse past performance evaluations obtained from references on which it has not previously had an opportunity to comment, if that information makes a difference in the Government's decision whether or not to include the offeror in the shortlist for Phase II.

**3.0 PHASE I EVALUATION FACTORS:** The SSEB will perform a risk assessment considering the degree of success of the Design-Build (D-B) teams' recent experience. The primary areas of evaluation are outlined below. **All of the Phase I evaluation factors and subfactors are weighted equally.**

Factor 1: PAST PERFORMANCE

Factor 2: CORPORATE RELEVANT SPECIALIZED EXPERIENCE

Factor 3: CAPACITY TO PERFORM

Factor 4: TECHNICAL APPROACH NARRATIVE

Factor 5: UTILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS

### **3.1 METHOD OF PROPOSAL EVALUATION (PHASE I)**

Proposal evaluation is an assessment of the proposal and the Offeror's ability to perform the prospective contract successfully. The Government will evaluate proposals and then assess their relative qualities solely on the factors specified in the solicitation. Evaluation will consist of reviewing responses to factors 1 through 5, found in this section. An analysis of the information will be conducted and will result in an adjectival rating based upon performance risk, technical merit and proposal risk. The Government will document the relative strengths, deficiencies, significant weaknesses, and risks of each proposal.

### **4.0 PHASE I DETAILED EVALUATION CRITERIA:**

#### **4.1 TAB 2 - FACTOR 1: OFFEROR PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION (No subfactors)**

##### **Offeror's Submission Requirements:**

- a. Past Performance Questionnaires. Offeror shall identify **THREE (3)** similar projects completed, or substantially completed in the past ten years to be used for reference and evaluation purposes and provide a questionnaire to the Point of Contact for each project listed. When completed, these forms shall be mailed, faxed, or e-mailed to the Los Angeles District Contract Specialist identified in the sample transmittal letter provided. It is the Offeror's responsibility to ensure that the reference documentation is provided as the Government may not make additional requests for past performance information from the references. The **QUESTIONNAIRE** shall be provided to the Los Angeles District directly from the reference.
- b. If the Offeror is made up of separate design and construction companies that have combined for this project, then Past Performance Questionnaires must be completed twice (once for each company).
- c. Firms that combine **AS A** joint venture for the purpose of proposing and executing this project shall provide **THREE** Past Performance Questionnaires for each member of the joint venture.
- d. Projects for which questionnaires are received shall have been competed or substantially completed within **TEN YEARS** of the date of the solicitation.
- e. Past Performance Information Sheets. Offerors and Designers shall complete and provide Past Performance Information Sheets on **THE** projects described above. **A sample Past Performance Information Sheet is included at page 00110-13**
- f. The experience of individuals will not be credited under this factor.

**EVALUATION CRITERIA – FACTOR 1: PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION.** The Government will evaluate the Offeror's past performance using the sources available to it including, but not limited to: the example of projects identified by the Offeror, Past Performance Evaluation Questionnaires received, ACASS, and CCASS. Offerors may be provided an opportunity to address any negative past performance information about which the Offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond. The Government treats an Offeror's lack of past performance as having no positive or negative evaluation significance. The Government will evaluate past performance based on the elements listed below:

- a. **QUALITY OF CONSTRUCTION:** Based on information provided in the questionnaire and other information, the Government will assess the quality of the actual construction undertaken and the standards of workmanship exhibited by the Offeror's team.
- b. **TIMELINESS OF PERFORMANCE:** The Government will evaluate all information available with respect to the Offeror completing past performance projects within the scheduled completion times.
- c. **DOCUMENTATION:** The Government will evaluate all information available with respect to the Offeror's level of meeting customer satisfaction on timeliness and quality of documentation, reports, and other written materials completed by the Offeror on past projects.
- d. **CUSTOMER SATISFACTION:** The Government will evaluate all information available with respect to the Offeror's past customer satisfaction, cooperation with customers, and interaction on past projects.
- e. **SUBCONTRACTOR MANAGEMENT:** The Government will evaluate all information available with respect to the Offeror's management of subcontractors on past projects.

SAMPLE TRANSMITTAL LETTER FOR PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRES

Please send your completed questionnaire to the following address to arrive **NOT LATER THAN 04 AUGUST 2005.**

Physical Address:

US Army Engineer District, Los Angeles  
CESPL-CT-W (Cindy Myrtetus McManus)  
915 Wilshire Blvd., Room 1040  
Los Angeles, California 90017

Mailing Address:

US Army Engineer District, Los Angeles  
CESPL-CT-W (Cindy Myrtetus McManus)  
Post Office Box 532711  
Los Angeles, California 90053-2325

SOLICITATION NO. W912PL-05-R-0004

TITLE: Main Base Runway Replacement, Edwards AFB, CA

The questionnaires can also be emailed to [cynthia.h.myrtetus@usace.army.mil](mailto:cynthia.h.myrtetus@usace.army.mil); or faxed to 213-452-4187. If you have questions regarding the attached questionnaire, or require assistance, please contact Cindy Myrtetus at 213-452-3247. Thank you for your assistance.

PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE  
W912PL-05-R-0004  
Main Base Runway Replacement  
Edwards Air Force Base, California

Upon completion of this form, please send directly to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in the enclosed addressed envelope Attn: Cindy Myrtetus or emailed to [cynthia.h.myrtetus@usace.army.mil](mailto:cynthia.h.myrtetus@usace.army.mil); or fax to Cindy Myrtetus McManus at 213-452-4187. Do not return this form to our offices. Thank you.

1. Contractor/Name & Address (City and State):

2. Type of Contract: Fixed Price \_\_\_\_\_ Cost Reimbursement \_\_\_\_\_  
Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

3. Contract Number: \_\_\_\_\_

4. Description of Work: (Attach additional pages as necessary)

5. Complexity of Work: High \_\_\_\_\_ Mid \_\_\_\_\_ Routine \_\_\_\_\_

6. Location of Work: \_\_\_\_\_

7. Date of Award: \_\_\_\_\_

8. Status:       Active \_\_\_\_\_ (provide percent complete)  
                  Complete \_\_\_\_\_ (provide completion date)

9. Name, address and telephone number of Contracting Officer's Technical Representative:



**Main Base Runway Replacement  
Edwards Air Force Base, California**

**10. QUALITY OF CONSTRUCTION:**

Evaluate the contractor's performance in complying with contract requirements, quality achieved and overall technical expertise demonstrated.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Outstanding Quality  |  |
| Above Average Quality                                      |  |
| Satisfactory Quality                                       |  |
| Marginal Quality   |  |
| Unsatisfactory or Experienced Significant Quality Problems |  |

Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**11. TIMELINESS OF PERFORMANCE:**

To what extent did the contractor meet the contract and/or individual task order schedules if the contract was an indefinite delivery type contract?

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Completed Substantially Ahead of Schedule (Outstanding)                                |  |
| Completed Ahead of Schedule (Above Average)  |  |
| Completed on Schedule with Minor Delays Under Extenuating Circumstances (Satisfactory) |  |
| Completed Behind Schedule (Marginal)   |  |
| Experienced Significant Delays without Justification (Unsatisfactory)                  |  |

Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Main Base Runway Replacement  
Edwards Air Force Base, California**

**12. CUSTOMER SATISFACTION:**

To what extent were the end users satisfied with:

|                                       | Quality | Cost | Schedule |
|---------------------------------------|---------|------|----------|
| Exceptionally Satisfied (Outstanding) |         |      |          |
| Highly Satisfied (Above Average)      |         |      |          |
| Satisfied (Satisfactory)              |         |      |          |
| Somewhat Dissatisfied (Marginal)      |         |      |          |
| Highly Dissatisfied (Unsatisfactory)  |         |      |          |

Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**13. SUBCONTRACTOR MANAGEMENT**

How well did the contractor manage and coordinate subcontractors, suppliers, and the labor force?

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Outstanding management and coordination of subcontractors    |  |
| Above Average management and coordination of subcontractors  |  |
| Satisfactory management and coordination of subcontractors   |  |
| Marginal management and coordination of subcontractors       |  |
| Unsatisfactory management and coordination of subcontractors |  |

Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Main Base Runway Replacement**

**Edwards Air Force Base, California**

**14. DOCUMENTATION**

To what extent were the contractor's reports and documentation accurate, complete and were they submitted in a timely manner?

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| Outstanding Documentation    |  |
| Above Average Documentation  |  |
| Satisfactory Documentation   |  |
| Marginal Documentation       |  |
| Unsatisfactory Documentation |  |

Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**15. IF GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY, WOULD YOU WORK WITH THIS CONTRACTOR AGAIN?**

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Not Sure \_\_\_\_\_

**16. OTHER REMARKS:**

Use the space below to provide other information related to the contractor's performance. This may include the contractor's selection and management of subcontractors, flexibility in dealing with contract challenges, their overall concern for the Government's interest (if applicable), project awards received, etc.

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**4.2 TAB 3 - FACTOR 2: CORPORATE RELEVANT SPECIALIZED EXPERIENCE. (No Subfactors)**

Offerors shall be evaluated on design/build construction and/or design projects completed or substantially completed in the last ten years that demonstrate the Offeror's specialized experience in the construction of similar construction projects. **A sample project information sheet is attached.** For this proposal, similar projects are those that meet the following criteria:

- a. Projects submitted by the Offerors shall have a construction dollar value of \$25,000,000.00 or higher.
- b. Design of large airfields, runways, taxiways, or aprons.
- c. Construction of large airfield, runways, taxiways or aprons.
- d. Each example does not have to include all of the above criteria, however, projects that do include all the criteria will be more highly rated.

**Offeror's Submission Requirements:** Offerors shall submit **THREE** Project Information Sheets for construction and design projects completed or substantially completed, that reflects specialized experience in the construction elements referenced in the paragraphs above. As a minimum, the Project Information Sheets shall provide:

- a. The Project Point of Contact with telephone number, general character, scope, location, cost, and date of completion or anticipated completion.
- b. If the Offeror represents the combining of two or more companies (**a Joint Venture**) for the purpose of this proposal, each company shall list project examples.
- c. Example projects must have been completed or substantially completed not more than ten years prior to the date of this solicitation.
- d. The experience of individuals will not be credited under this factor.

**EVALUATION CRITERIA – FACTOR 2: CORPORATE RELEVANT SPECIALIZED EXPERIENCE.**

The Government will evaluate the depth and breadth of the Offeror's corporate experience on the basis of the number of times it has performed projects that were similar in nature, size, scope and complexity as the work required by the solicitation. Completed DATA SHEETS shall be used as the basis to begin the evaluation of this factor. The Government will review the example construction and/or design projects provided by the Offeror to evaluate and rate the recent relevant specialized experience of the Offeror for similar projects. The example of construction and/or design projects should closely resemble the scope, size, and complexity of the project identified in the solicitation. If the Offeror cannot provide suitable relevant experience and the evaluators consider that the information provided indicates that the Offeror has no relevant experience, a determination will be made as to the risk this lack of corporate experience presents to the Government and the proposal will be rated accordingly.

PROJECT INFORMATION SHEET

FACTOR 2: CORPORATE RELEVANT SPECIALIZED EXPERIENCE.

On an attached sheet, provide information for completed projects or substantially complete that are similar in terms of cost, complexity, design or features, (See elements identified in paragraph 4 of Section 00100) that have been proposed by the offeror to be used for reference and evaluation purposes. For each project provide the following information:

Project Title:

Location:

Contract number:

Nature of involvement in this project, i.e. General Contractor, subcontractor, designer:

Procuring activity:

Procurement point of contact and telephone number:

List date of construction completion or percent completion if construction is underway:

Address of building(s):

Address and telephone number of owner:

Indicate type of project (private sector, Government, planned unit development, etc.):

General character:

Total cost:

**IN ADDITION, PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION FOR EACH FIRM RESPONDING, INCLUDING ALL FIRMS OF A JOINT VENTURE.**

1. LIQUIDATED DAMAGES. On an attached sheet, list any projects within the last ten years that have been assessed liquidated damages. Provide an explanation.
2. TERMINATED PROJECTS. On an attached sheet, list any projects within the last ten years that have been terminated. Provide an explanation.
3. GOVERNMENT PROJECTS. On an attached sheet, list all contracts with the Government within the last ten years. Indicate Government contract number and contracting agency (with contact names and telephone numbers).
4. CADD CAPABILITIES. On an attached sheet, describe your office capabilities for using CADD (Computer Aided Design and Drafting) and other forms of automation on this project.

**4.3 TAB 4 - FACTOR 3: CAPACITY TO PERFORM. (4 Subfactors)**

- 3a. Resource and Management Commitment**
- 3b. Financial Capacity**
- 3c. Subcontractors**
- 3d. Project Key Personnel**

**Sub factor 3a: Resource and Management Commitment.** Demonstrate personnel and resources to be utilized for this project as well as additional resources available if necessary. Response to this section shall include, as a minimum, the following:

- (1) A list of professional job titles and the number of personnel in each category for each key firm on the Design-Build team, to include a resource manning chart and an estimate of how many personnel will be working primarily on this project month by month. Do not provide biographical information in this section.
- (2) A list of any other corporate resources, subsidiaries, manufacturing facilities, construction equipment, etc. which may be used to the benefit of this project.
- (3) A description of the firm's computer-aided (CADD) design capabilities and plan and a list of the design resources that can be dedicated to the project.
- (4) Discuss the roles that upper management will play in this Design-Build project and the process by which management issues encountered at the working level may be expeditiously elevated to upper management for resolution. Limit discussion to two pages.

**Sub factor 3b: Financial Capacity** Demonstrate financial capability for providing Design-build services for this project. This information may be in any format, but as a minimum, provide the following:

**Bonding capacity.** Demonstrate bonding capacity for providing design-build services for this contract. This information shall be in the format of a letter of current bonding capacity from a bonding company and will be considered a pass/fail element of the evaluation process. Offerors submitting a proposal shall demonstrate bonding capability of \$40 million or greater. **If the offeror cannot demonstrate sufficient bonding capacity during Phase I evaluation, further consideration of the proposal will be terminated and the offeror will be rejected.**

**Sub factor 3c: Subcontractors:** Describe in a narrative description the work that will be subcontracted, the subcontractors who will perform the work, and the experience and capabilities of the subcontractors to complete their assigned work within the construction schedule.

**Sub factor 3d: Project Key Personnel:**

- (1) Provide the names, condensed resumes, and levels of responsibility of the principal managers and technical personnel who will be directly responsible for the day-to-day design and construction activities. Include as a minimum the following:

- Project Manager
- Project Civil Engineer (Engineer responsible for the pavement design)
- Construction Manager, On Site Senior Representative for Contractor
- Construction quality Control Manager
- Design Quality Control Manager

- (2) Indicate whether each individual has had a significant part in any of the project examples cited. If reassignment of personnel is considered possible, provide the names and resumes of the alternate professional in each assignment

(3) Provide a narrative and/or diagram that outlines the relationships and interactions between each of the key personnel identified above. The narrative shall be limited to five (5) pages.

(4) Project Key Personnel shall **ALSO** include any **KEY** construction subcontractors and the extent of their role with respect to the design phases of this project. For each subcontractor, the prime contractor's experience working with that sub should be indicated and the sub's past experience in work similar in nature to the project being evaluated should be submitted. Key construction subcontractors may include, but not be limited to:

Concrete subcontractor(s)  
Site Development subcontractor(s)

### **EVALUATION CRITERIA – FACTOR 3: CAPACITY TO PERFORM.**

a. **Resources and Management Commitment** evaluation will be based on list of corporate resources and how those resources will be able to meet project requirements and schedule.

b. **Financial Capacity** will be evaluated based on DUN & Bradstreet ratings and bonding capacity. Offeror will demonstrate adequate financial capability to complete the project.

c. **Subcontractors** will be evaluated based on their experience to complete the assigned work within the construction schedule.

d. **Project Key Personnel:** The Government will evaluate and rate the Key Personnel identified. The resumes and levels of responsibility of the principal managers and technical personnel who will be directly responsible for the day-to-day design and construction activities will be evaluated. Data should indicate whether each individual has had a significant part in the project examples cited. If reassignment of personnel is considered possible, the names and resumes of the alternative professionals for each assignment will be evaluated.

**4.4 TAB 5 - FACTOR 4: TECHNICAL APPROACH NARRATIVE. (6 Subfactors)**

- 4a: Team Organization and Responsibilities**
- 4b: Project Organization**
- 4c: Design and Construction Management**
- 4d: Quality Control**
- 4e: Schedule Control**
- 4f: Cost Control**

**Offeror's submission Requirements:**

**Sub factor 4a: Team Organization and Responsibilities:** Describe interactions with the Corps of Engineers and the project owner and the roles that different team members will play when dealing with design and construction changes, resolving potential delays, reviewing and approving submittals, attending progress meetings, keeping design and construction on schedule, and facilitating contract completion and closeout. Limit discussion to approximately two pages.

**Sub factor 4b: Project Organization:**

- (1) Provide an organizational chart which describes how the team will be structured, i.e. how many firms are involved and the responsibility of each firm for this project. Include key personnel for active day-to-day management and key engineering disciplines.
- (2) Describe communication and management measures to be employed during the Design-Build process to effectively coordinate architectural and engineering professionals, trade subcontractors and construction personnel in a team effort. Indicate the level of detail you propose to employ for proper documentation of drawings and specifications. Discuss how HQ AFMC, the Corps of Engineers and the Edwards Air Force Base Civil Engineering Group will be made part of the team.
- (3) Demonstrate your firm's construction management philosophy, especially as it relates to the Design-Build process. Describe the benefits it will bring to the Government, particularly in the areas of time and cost control.
- (4) Limit discussion to approximately four pages.

**Sub factor 4c: Design and Construction Management:**

- (1) Provide in detail the organization's plan to coordinate, control, and document the design of this project within the requirements of this RFP amendment. Detail the offeror's design management strategy to insure design quality control, schedule conformance, cost control, labor management and allocation, timely submittals, and subcontractor performance. The plan should also describe the involvement of the design team in the construction phase of the project.
- (2) Provide in detail the organization's plan to manage, coordinate, integrate, control, and document the construction of this project within the requirements of the RFP amendment. Detail the construction management strategy and tactics to ensure quality workmanship, schedule conformance, cost control, labor management and allocation, timely submittals, and subcontractor performance. The plan should also describe the involvement of key construction team personnel in the design phase of the project.
- (3) Describe the proposed quality control organization for both design and construction. Include a chart showing lines of authority that the quality control staff shall follow in conducting the review and inspections for all aspects of the work specified and the methods used to report to the project manager or someone higher in the Contractor's organization.
- (4) Describe the firm's plan for achieving effective communications and design and construction management efficiencies.

**Sub factor 4d: Quality Control:** Demonstrate procedures and abilities to control quality throughout the



design process in the development of the construction documents of the project. Present a plan to control quality throughout the construction process, to include testing, inspection, and safety. Provide one or more examples of how these measures have succeeded on your projects in the past. Limit discussion to approximately two pages.

**Sub factor 4e: Schedule Control:**

- (1) Describe how your firm will control the time and schedule during the design and construction parts of the project. Present a plan to control design schedules and construction schedules and time. Limit discussion to one page.
- (2) Demonstrate ability to minimize time overruns due to changes, unforeseen circumstances and delays. Describe the time control systems to be utilized and how time control savings proposals will be presented. Limit discussion to approximately two pages.
- (3) Describe the firm's philosophy in controlling and managing design and construction schedules and time in Design-Build projects.

**Sub factor 4f: Cost Control:**

- (1) Describe the Design-Build project team's ability to maintain a project budget during design and construction.
- (2) Describe the cost control systems and procedures that will be utilized.
- (3) Describe the procedures and the format with which cost savings proposals will be presented.
- (4) Describe a plan to minimize cost overruns caused by owner initiated changes, unnecessary specification requirements, unforeseen circumstances, and delays.
- (5) Describe a plan to recognize and maximize User requirements while minimizing or maintaining costs.
- (6) Provide one or more examples of how you have controlled project budgets in the past
- (7) Limit discussion to approximately three pages.

**EVALUATION CRITERIA – FACTOR 4: TECHNICAL APPROACH NARRATIVE:** Evaluation will be based on the following:

- a. Does the offeror demonstrate a suitable understanding of the process to enable it to adequately address and anticipate the risks associated with the Design/Build process
- b. Does the project organization adequately enable the Offeror to meet the project requirements and schedule?
- c. Does the design and construction management approach mitigate schedule and performance risk?
- d. Does the quality control process demonstrate the ability to deliver a high quality product?
- e. Schedule Information. The schedule will be evaluated to assess the rationale of how the Offeror intends to comply with the submitted schedule. The schedule must reflect a single task oriented structure for both design and construction. The schedule will be reviewed for completeness and the inclusion of required milestones. A schedule that improves on the Government supplied goal, supported by the narrative, will be considered more favorably during the evaluation.

**4.5 TAB 6 - FACTOR 5: UTILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS. (No Subfactors)**

All offerors are required to provide a narrative discussion of their plan for Utilization of Small and Small Disadvantaged Business. At a minimum, the narrative shall discuss:

- a. Goals for subcontracting with small and small disadvantaged businesses in sufficient detail to allow Government evaluators to determine that these goals are realistic, justifiable, positive, and in accordance with the Government's policy to maximize opportunities for these types of businesses.
- b. The extent to which small disadvantaged businesses, and where appropriate, historically black colleges and universities/minority institutions (HBCU/MI) have been identified for participation as part of the Offeror's team.
- c. The Offeror's past and present commitment to providing subcontracting opportunities and encouragement to the small and small disadvantaged businesses.

**EVALUATION CRITERIA – FACTOR 5: SMALL AND SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS**

**UTILIZATION:** The Government will evaluate the narrative in accordance with the Factor. Greater detail and specificity will be given greater credit than general statements and commitments.

NOTE: An offeror not in full compliance with the submission requirements for this Factor will receive a rating no lower than "Marginal," as long as the offeror has attempted to respond to the proposal submission requirements. Notwithstanding the above, an offeror who fails to provide any information at all for evaluation under this Factor will receive an "Unsatisfactory" rating.

(End Phase I)

## 5.0 PHASE II EVALUATION PROCESS

### 5.1 General:

The evaluation process essentially consists of four parts: proposal compliance review, technical/quality evaluation, price evaluation and cost/technical tradeoff analysis.

**5.1.1 Proposal Compliance Review:** This is an initial check by contracting on the basis of the solicitation requirements. This review may eliminate those proposals that fail to provide both a Technical/Quality proposals and a price proposal.

**5.1.2 Technical/Quality Evaluation:** The SSEB will evaluate only those proposals passing the first review, as stated above. Technical/quality evaluation consists of an evaluation and assigning a quality/risk rating to the Phase II factors and sub factors. The SSEB will not consolidate the Phase I evaluation ratings with the Phase II evaluations. Phase II proposal ratings alone will be used to determine the most advantageous proposal to the Government.

**5.1.3 Price Evaluation:** The Government will initially evaluate price independently from the technical evaluation. Price will not be scored or rated, but will be evaluated for fairness and reasonableness through the use of a price analysis. It may also be analyzed to determine whether it is realistic for the work to be performed; reflects a clear understanding of the requirements; and is consistent with the Offeror's technical proposal. Additionally, all offers with separately priced line items or sub line items will be analyzed for unbalanced pricing. **When applicable, the Price Evaluation Preference for HUBZone Small Business Concerns will be applied to this procurement. The Price Evaluation Preference for Small disadvantaged Business will not be applied to this procurement as it is currently suspended from DoD.**

**5.1.4 Price/Technical Trade-off Analysis:** After the price analysis and technical/quality evaluations are complete, the Government will then consider the price in connection with Phase II technical/quality evaluation to determine the proposals offering the overall best value to the Government. The Government will compare the relative strengths/advantages and weaknesses/disadvantages of the technical proposals and will compare prices. The tradeoff analysis will be conducted upon completion of the quality/price evaluations of Final Proposal revisions, if communications/discussions are necessary, or after evaluation of initial offers, if discussion will not be necessary.

## 6.0 PHASE II DETAILED EVALUATION CRITERIA :

The evaluation factors and sub factors that **may be used** to determine the merit of the technical proposals during Phase II of the selection process are listed below. The relative weights assigned to the factors and subfactors is as follows: All evaluation factors and subfactors are of equal importance. **Please do not address or submit with Phase I Proposal, they are provided for information and planning purposes only.**

### Phase II Evaluation Factors:

- Factor 6: CONCEPT OF DESIGN
- Factor 7: PROJECT SCHEDULE AND CONSTRUCTION SEQUENCING
- Factor 8: RUNWAY SUSTAINABLE DESIGN
- Factor 9: CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT APPROACH

**6.1 TAB 2 - FACTOR 6 CONCEPT OF DESIGN (including Codes UFC, FAA, etc) to include: (No Subfactors)**

**Legend: T=Table, P=Plan, D=Drawings, to include detail, C=Calculations, N=Narrative**

**Offeror's Submission Requirements:** The technical data described in Factor 6 shall be submitted as part of the formal proposal during Phase II. Do not supply with Phase I submittal. Graphically describe all alternate designs on separate drawings for the basic proposal. Be advised that the required data listed above will be utilized for technical review and evaluation and used for determination of a "Quality Rating" by the Technical Evaluation Team. Materials indicated in the design/construction criteria, but not indicated in the Offeror's submissions, will be assumed to be included and a part of the proposal.

**a: Pavement of Design, for temporary runway and main runway.** Submit typical pavement design and details

**b: Electrical.** Submit Narrative.

**c: Joints.** Submit Details/Narrative

**d: Arresting Systems.** Submit Narrative.

**e: Drainage Plan.** Submit Narrative

**f: Demolition Plan and Disposal/Recycle.** Submit Narrative.

**g: Soil Investigation.** Submit Narrative.

**h: Mix Design.** Submit Narratives.

**i: Site Plan.** Submit Narrative.

**j: Lakebed Access.** Submit Narrative.

**k: QA/QC for Design and Construction.** Submit Plan/Narrative.

**EVALUATION CRITERIA - FACTOR 6: CONCEPT OF DESIGN:** Evaluation will be based on the above factors **a** through **k** for soundness, integrity, knowledge of applicable codes and specs and overall narrative descriptions demonstrating on how he will meet the Air Force requirements, including mitigation of impact to flight test operations. The design will be reviewed for completeness and the inclusion of all RFP technical requirements.

**6.2 TAB 3 - FACTOR 7: PROJECT SCHEDULE AND CONSTRUCTION SEQUENCING: (No Subfactors)**

**Offeror's Submission Requirements:**

- a. Provide a networked design and construction schedule in Gantt chart format indicating the offeror's proposed design and construction activities for the project. The Government encourages concurrent design and construction on this project. The Government will favorably consider in the Source Selection Evaluation offers that include techniques to perform the design and construction in an integrated, efficient and obtainable activity. This would include starting construction before the final design is approved. Construction sequencing should take into account fiscal year funding limitations, transition of flight operations between runways, and environmental control (emissions).
- b. Provide a plan that demonstrates continuous aircraft and vehicle access to runways with minimal impact to flight operations (ramps, taxiways and South Base).

**EVALUATION CRITERIA - FACTOR 7: PROJECT SCHEDULING AND CONSTRUCTION SEQUENCING.**

The schedule will be evaluated to assess the rationale of how the offeror intends to comply with the submitted schedule. The schedule must reflect a single task oriented structure for both design and construction. The schedule will be reviewed for completeness and the inclusion of the required milestones. A schedule that improves on the Government supplied goal, supported by the narrative, will be considered more favorable during the technical evaluation. The Sequencing Plan will be evaluated to assess the construction schedule impact on mission operations.

**6.3 TAB 4 - FACTOR 8: RUNWAY SUSTAINABLE DESIGN (Include issues on maintenance). (No Subfactors)**

**Offeror's Submission Requirements:**

- a. Provide a descriptive narrative of the sustainability features of the overall design. Show calculations and data supporting special features that reduce life cycle costs.
- b. Temporary runway maintenance plan to maintain serviceability until main runway becomes fully operational.
- c. Lifecycle analysis on main base runway.

**EVALUATION CRITERIA – FACTOR 8: RUNWAY SUSTAINABLE DESIGN:** The Government will evaluate this factor based on elimination of government maintenance of the temporary runway, minimization of government maintenance of the main runway during the life of the pavement and maximization of the life of the main runway pavement. The Government will evaluate the contractor more favorably for recycling of existing concrete rather than disposing it in a landfill.

**6.4 TAB 5 - FACTOR 9: CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT APPROACH (QA, QC, Material Evaluations, etc) to include: (No Subfactors)**

- a. Borrow Material
- b. ASR Mitigation
- c. Site Access Plan
- d. Mobilization and Demobilization
- e. Recycling
- f. Interface with Flight Operations/Flightline Training
- g. Security
- h. Batch Plant/Material Delivery
- i. Environmental Plan, Training/Emission 66 ton per phase/per year
- j. Internal/External Communications Plan
- k. Permits/Waivers
- l. QA/QC Plan for Design and Construction

**Offeror's Submission Requirements:** The technical data described in Factor 9 above shall be submitted as part of the Phase II proposal. Graphically describe all alternate designs on separate drawings from the Phase II proposal. Be advised that the required data listed above will be utilized for technical review and evaluation and used for determination of a "Quality Rating" by the Technical Evaluation Team. Materials indicated in the design/construction criteria, but not indicated in the offeror's submissions, will be assumed to be included and a part of the proposal.

**EVALUATION CRITERIA - FACTOR 9: CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT APPROACH.** Evaluation will be based on the offeror's narrative description on how he will manage the requirements for the above construction events and how these events are smoothly integrated into the overall construction schedule. The construction management approach will be reviewed for completeness and the inclusion of all RFP technical requirements, including mitigation of the risks of cost overruns and schedule slippage, mitigation of impact on flight test operations, teaming philosophy between all parties involved, and that the design will ensure an effective and efficient construction project.

**7.0 PRICE PROPOSAL To be submitted during Phase II Evaluation Process. Do not submit at this time.**

The offeror shall submit a price proposal (Pricing Schedule will be provided during Phase II of the RFP) for each of the scope of work items. Price proposal shall show applicable overhead and profit as separate cost items. The Government reserves the right to make inquiries into the information disclosed. The submission of false or misleading information may be grounds for disqualification of the proposal. The offeror's cost proposal will be evaluated on the basis of its completeness and compliance to the RFP.

## 8.0 METHOD OF PROPOSAL EVALUATION (PHASE II)

Proposal evaluation is an assessment of the proposal and the Offeror's ability to perform the prospective contract successfully. The Government will evaluate proposals and then assess their relative qualities solely on the factors specified in the solicitation. Evaluation will consist of reviewing technical proposal responses to technical factors 6 through 9, found in this section,. An analysis of the technical proposal responses will be conducted and will result in an adjectival rating based upon performance risk, technical merit and proposal risk. The Government will document the relative strengths, deficiencies, significant weaknesses, and risks of each proposal.

Quality. The quality of the product or service is addressed in every source selection through consideration of one or more non-cost evaluation factors. The non-cost factors and significant sub factors that apply to this acquisition are identified herein.

### Relative importance of cost/price to other factors.

Award of the Design-Build contract will be made to that offeror whose proposal contains the combination of those criteria offering the best overall value to the Government. This will be determined by comparing differences in the value of non-cost technical and management features with differences in cost/price to the Government.

**In making this comparison, all evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are approximately equal to cost or price. The Government is concerned with striking the most advantageous balance between technical merit (quality) and management features and cost to the Government (i.e., price).**

The degree of importance of cost could become greater depending upon the equality of the proposals for the other non-cost evaluation factors. Where competing proposals are determined to be substantially equal, cost factors would become the controlling factor.

Risk Assessment. The two types of risk evaluated as part of this source selection process are proposal risk and performance risk. Proposal risks are those associated with an Offeror's proposed approach in meeting the requirements of the solicitation. It is an assessment that is integral to the evaluation of technical merit for each factor (except for past performance, as indicated below). Performance risks are those associated with an Offeror's likelihood of success in performing the solicitation's requirements as indicated by that Offeror's record of past performance. Performance risk is assessed separately from the other technical merit evaluation factors under the Past Performance evaluation factor.

## PERMISSIBLE EXCHANGE WITH OFFERORS PRIOR TO EITHER AWARD WITHOUT DISCUSSIONS OR ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMPETITIVE RANGE

Selection Without Discussions: It is the intent of the Government to make selections based on initial offers, without conducting further discussions or requesting additional information. Therefore, proposals should be submitted initially on the most favorable terms. If discussions are conducted, the Government, after receipt of Final Proposal Revisions, will evaluate supplemental information provided by the offerors. Selection will be made on the basis of the best proposal conforming to the requirements of the Request for Proposals.

Clarifications: If award will be made without conducting discussions, offerors may be given the opportunity to clarify certain aspects of the proposal.

Communications: If the Government is not able to make award without discussion, the Government may exchange communications with Offerors for the purpose of addressing issues that must be explored to determine whether a proposal should be placed in the competitive range. These communications will not provide an opportunity for the

Offeror to revise its proposal, but may be considered by the Government in rating proposals for the purposes of establishing the competitive range.

Discussions: When negotiations are conducted in a competitive acquisition, they take place after establishment of the competitive range and are called discussions. These discussions, if held, will be conducted by the Government with each Offeror within the competitive range and will be tailored to each Offeror's proposal. The Government will indicate to each Offeror still being considered for award the significant weaknesses, deficiencies, and other aspects of its proposal (such as cost, price, technical approach, past performance, and terms and conditions) that could, in the opinion of the Government, be altered or explained to enhance materially the proposal's potential for award. The scope and extent of discussions are a matter of Contracting Officer judgment. Discussions may be held orally or in writing. During the conduct of discussions, the Contracting Officer may request or allow proposal revisions to document understandings reached during negotiations.

Elimination from the competitive range: An Offeror originally in the competitive range that is no longer considered to be among the most highly rated Offerors being considered for award may be eliminated from the competitive range after discussions have begun. The Offeror may be eliminated whether or not all material aspects of the proposal have been discussed or whether or not the Offeror has been afforded an opportunity to submit a proposal revision. If an Offeror's proposal is eliminated or otherwise removed from the competitive range, no further revisions to that Offeror's proposal will be accepted or considered.

Final Proposal Revision: At the conclusion of discussions, each Offeror still in the competitive range will be given an opportunity to submit a final proposal revision.

## 9. SELECTION & AWARD, PHASE II

The Phase I evaluation process will provide an opportunity to the offerors remaining in the selection process (maximum of five) to submit proposals for the Phase II selection process. Award of the Design-Build contract (after evaluation of Phase II) will be made to the firm which, in the judgment of the Contracting Officer, represents the best value to the Government. The Government reserves the right to make award to other than the lowest priced offeror, price and other factors considered. The Government also reserves the right to make award without discussions.

END OF SECTION



| Question Number | RFQ Section, Page, and Line  | Question  | Government Response  |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
| 1               | Project website at:<br><a href="http://www.spl.usace.army.mil/edwardsafb/runway.htm">http://www.spl.usace.army.mil/edwardsafb/runway.htm</a> | What are the updated "Project Milestone Dates?" The project web site still indicates that "Preliminary Step 1 Solicitation has been delayed to a later date," and many of the milestone dates have already passed.  | That website will be updated soon. Our official contracting website is <a href="https://ebs.spl.usace.army.mil">https://ebs.spl.usace.army.mil</a> Please refer to this website for contracting information. |
| 2               | Page 00100-2, Paragraph 52.204-6(a)  | If the Offeror is a JV, does the JV need to apply for and submit a DUNS number, or may we provide the DUNS numbers of the firms making up the JV? If firms have not formed a JV and delivered projects before, the DUNS information for the "new" JV firm will provide no relevant information to the Government.   | Yes. In addition, provide the DUNS numbers for all of the Joint Venture firms. A JV will need to file as an entity in CCR, obtain a CAGE code and a Taxpayer ID Number                                       |
| 3               | Page 00100-28, Section 5a, Number of Sets of Phase I Proposal required   | The RFQ states "Submit the Original and six (6) additional sets of the written Phase I Proposal (i.e., the Original and six (6) copies of the information required below, with each set separately packaged). Also submit one CD ROM disk containing the entire Phase I proposal."<br><br>What is the intent of "each set separately packaged?" Please clarify if it is meant to submit each copy in individual delivery packages, or the original in a separate package and each of the six (6) copies in a separate packages, or if the original and the six (6) copies can be submitted in a single delivery container or package. | The original and 6 copies, appropriately marked, may be submitted in a single delivery container.  |
| 4               | Page 00110-3, Tab 2, Factor 1, Paragraph C   | If a design firm and construction firm form a JV to submit for the project, then does this JV submit a total of twenty-six (26) projects for this factor, or do the twenty (20) projects submitted as their response to Factor 1.b suffice? If firms have not formed a JV to deliver previous projects, they will not have projects delivered by the JV to submit for evaluation, if this is the intent of Factor 1.c..   | Please see Revised Section 00110-3   |
| 5               | Page 00110-6   | The Sample Transmittal Letter has the date to send completed questionnaires back to the Corps as 02 June 2005. What is the updated date to have them returned to the Government to meet your evaluation dates?  | This should read 04 August 2005, 00110-5   |
| 6               | Page 00110-11, Tab 3 Factor 2, Offeror's Submission Requirements, Paragraph b  | Does this factor require submittal of ten (10) Project Information Sheets for each firm making up the Offeror, so that a JV consisting of two (2) firms must submit a total of twenty (20) Project Information Sheets?  | Please see Revised Section 00110-10. Each member of the JV must submit 3 Project Information Sheets  |
| 7               | Page 00110-11, Tab 3, Factor 2, Evaluation Criteria – Factor 2, Line 4   | Why does the Proposer submit ten (10) Project Information Sheets (or twenty (20) if two firms make up the Offeror) if the Government only intends to evaluate three (3) of the Project Information Sheets? How will the Government select the three (3) Project Information Sheets evaluation?  | Please see Revised Section 00110-10.   |
|                 |  |   |  |

| Question Number | RFQ Section, Page, and Line               | Question  | Government Response  |
|-----------------|---|---|--|
| 8               | Page 00110-3 section 4.1c.                | Should this section be deleted completely and replaced with: “Firms that combine to form a joint venture for the purpose of proposing and executing this project shall provide a minimum of three (3) Past Performance Information Sheets and a minimum of three (3) Past Performance Evaluation Questionnaires for each member of the joint venture.”?   | Please see Revised Section 00110-3.  |
| 9               | Page 00110-3 section 4.1 e., second line. | Should “...Sheet on <b>three</b> projects described...” be changed to “...Sheet on <b>the</b> projects described...”  | Please see Revised Section 00110-3.  |
| 10              | Page 000110-5.                            | Should “PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE” be changed to “PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION SHEETS”?  | Please see Revised Section 00110-11.   |
| 11              | Page 00110-5 Section 3., 4., 5., 6.       | Is the information regarding liquidated damages, terminated projects, government project, and CADD capabilities, to be limited only to the “past performance information sheet” projects included in our proposal?  | Please see 00110-11.   |
| 12              | Page 00110-6                              | Should the date the questionnaires are due be changed from “NOT LATER THAN 02 June 2005”?   | It should read 04 August 2005. 00110-5   |
| 13              | Page 00110-7                              | Past Performance Evaluation Questionnaire – This questionnaire is better suited for construction contracts than design contracts. Does the USACE have a Questionnaire that better relates to design contracts?  | No.  |
| 14              | Tab 2 Factor 1                            | Reference is made to Pages 00110-3 through 00110-10. Our team is a joint venture comprised of two (2) construction companies. We have a dedicated design professional on our team. However, the design professional is not part of the formal joint venture. The text in Tab 2 Factor 1 can be interpreted in several different ways. We believe this Tab/Factor allows our proposal to included a maximum of 20 Past Performance Information Sheets (10 total from the contractors and 10 from the designer) and each one of these 20 projects could have a Past Performance Evaluation Questionnaire mailed to the reference. Is this an accurate interpretation of the proposal documents? | Both of the JV construction firms and the design firm should submit 3 project questionnaires and project information sheets. |
|                 |   |   |  |

| Question Number | RFQ Section, Page, and Line               | Question  | Government Response   |
|-----------------|---|---|---|
| 15              | Tab 4 – Factor 3: Capacity to Perform     | Question 1: Reference Page 00110-13 Sub factor 3a: (1) A resource manning chart estimating how many personnel will be working primarily on this project month by month, is requested. We will not be accurate in estimating this level of effort at this time as we do not know the full scope of work or project approach at this stage of the procurement process. We will be better equipped to provide this information as a part of the Phase II stage of this procurement. Can this “monthly manning chart and estimating of how many personnel will be working on this project month to month” be deferred to the Phase II stage of the procurement? | This is part of the Phase I Source Selection  |
| 16              | Tab 4 – Factor 3: Capacity to Perform     | Question 2: Reference Page 00110-13 Sub factor 3c: Subcontractors: The full scope of work is not known at this time; as such we will not be able to accurately identify the complete subcontracting requirements for the project. We also do not know the names of the subcontractors that we will engage at this time as this determination will be made on a best value evaluation. Can this item be deferred to the Phase II stage of the procurement?   | This is part of the Phase I Source Selection.   |
| 17              | Reference 52.0219-4001                    | Question 3: SUBCONTRACTING PLAN page 00100-16<br>This \$103,000,000 design-build project will require the substantial involvement of a design firm. The cost of the design portion of this project is likely to be 5-10% of the total cost for the project. We do not believe it is practical or perhaps even possible to use small business firms to handle this scope of the project due to the size, complexity, staffing requirements, and prior experience needed. If an Offeror contracts with a designer to perform design duties on this project, will the dollar value of the design contract be included in the “TOTAL SUBCONTRACTING DOLLARS”?   | To be answered in Amendment 02  |
| 18              | 00100-16, SBE Subcontracting Requirements | Is 69% of the total subcontracting dollars to be divided among 40% small businesses, 10% small disadvantaged businesses, etc. – or are those figures percentages of the 40% of total subcontracting dollars to be dedicated towards small businesses?   | Of the total contract dollars estimated to be subcontracted out, 40% will go to Small Business, 10% to Small Disadvantaged Business, etc. |

| Question Number | RFQ Section, Page, and Line            | Question   | Government Response  |
|-----------------|--|--|--|
| 19              | 00110-5, CADD Capabilities             | Is it correct that this section is to be double-sided and 12 point font, even though there aren't these restrictions on the rest of the document?  | No. This has been revised. 00110-11  |
| 20              | 00110-16<br>Evaluation<br>Criteria # e | <p>Mentions "a schedule that improves on the Government supplied goal... will be considered more favorably during the evaluation."</p> <p>What is the Government supplied goal? We did not see it mentioned in the document. We wanted to make sure we adequately addressed the Government's concerns.</p>   | To be answered in Amendment 02   |
| 21              | 00110-14, 3c                           | <p>Subcontractors mentions that we need to describe the work that will be subcontracted, the subcontractors who will perform the work and their capability to do so.</p> <p>Begins by mentioning Key Personnel, and ends by talking about Key Subcontractors, but in the middle it mentions "For each subcontractor, the prime contractor's experience working with that sub should be indicated and the sub's past experience in work similar in nature to the project being evaluated should be submitted."</p> <p>Is that referring just to the Key Subcontractors (such as the concrete subcontractors and site development subcontractors) or all subcontractors?</p> | All Key Project Personnel and <u>Key</u> Construction Subcontractor Personnel  |
| 22              |  | <p>Can we cross-reference sections concerning similar information? (For example, 00110-15, 4c #3 &amp; 4d both discuss quality control organization).</p> <p>Will the entire evaluation team look at the entire SOQ, or will it be split into sections, thus preventing cross-referencing?</p>   | Cross referencing is not acceptable. Proposals should follow the order of sequence set forth in the RFP. Information provided out of sequence may not be evaluated and may result in the offeror's disqualification. |
| 23              | 00110-16,<br>Evaluation<br>Criteria #e | <p>How detailed of a schedule control information is required?</p> <p>Factor 4e mentions describing how our firm will control and manage schedule and time and unforeseen circumstances, and gives a page limit of roughly 3-5 pages, but the evaluation criteria mentions a submitted schedule as well as evaluating it for completeness and required milestones.</p> <p>What schedule? What are the required milestones? They were not mentioned in the document.</p>  | To be answered in Amendment 02   |

| Question Number | RFQ Section, Page, and Line                     | Question   | Government Response          |
|-----------------|---|--|------------------------------|
| 24              | Section 00600, Representations and Certificates | We are only expected to enclose the disclosures that apply to our company/joint venture. Correct?  | Yes                          |
| 25              | 00110-5, Past Performance Questionnaire         | - #3,4, 5, & 6 – Does the USACE want Liquidated Damages, Terminated Projects, Government Projects, & CADD capabilities for only the companies involved in the joint venture, or their parent company and their subsidiaries as well? | Only the Joint Venture firms |
|                 |   |  |                              |